

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated February 23, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendment, claims 1, 4, 10 and 13 are amended; and claims 3 and 12 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-11 and 13-18 are currently pending in the present application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, drawing figures 3 and 12 to 14 are objected to based on a number of minor informalities. In response, the drawing figures have been reviewed, and corrected Figs. 1-5, 10, 12-15, 17, 18 and 23 are submitted herewith. The corrected figures address each of the Examiner's objections as well as a number of other minor informalities discovered during the review of the drawings. In particular:

Fig. 1 has been amended to add a line connecting the POWER FEED CONTROL MECHANISM 17 and the POWER FEED CIRCUIT 16 (as in Fig. 17 for example);

Fig. 2 has been amended to add reference numeral 32;

Fig. 3 has been amended to correct the lead line from reference numeral 34b;

Fig. 4 has been amended to add reference numerals 12, 12a, 12b, 12c, and 17 to identify the rotary member, features thereof, and the feed control mechanism;

Fig. 5 has been amended to add reference numerals 17, 32 and 33;

Fig. 10 has been amended to add reference numeral 61;

Figs. 12-14 have each been amended to correct the lead line from reference numeral 34b;

Fig. 15 has been amended to change one occurrence of reference numeral 34a to 34b;

Fig. 17 has been amended to provide reference numerals 12, 14B, 14G, 14R, and 23 to identify the fluorescent lamps at the second rotary member, and the rotary shaft thereof; and

Fig. 23 has been amended to add reference numeral 11a to identify the light incident face.

As indicated above, the corrected drawing figures address each of the objections set forth by the Examiner, and thus, it is submitted that the objections to the drawings are now clearly obviated.

* * * *

Next, on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to based on a number of minor informalities. In response, the specification has been amended to correct each of the matters identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection to the specification is now clearly obviated.

Next, claim 13 is objected to due to the inadvertent inclusion of the language in line 2. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, the indicated language has been deleted thereby clearly obviating the objection.

Next, on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 3, 4, 7, 12 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, claims 3 and 12 have been cancelled and the limitations thereof have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Thus, independent claims 1 and 10 are now clearly

allowable. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the allowable independent claims, and thus are similarly allowable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Norikazu YAMAMOTO

By: Michael S. Huppert
Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicant

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 23, 2005